DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 434 168 UD 033 097

AUTHOR Allen, Ricky Lee
TITLE The Hidden Curriculum of Whiteness: White Teachers, White Territory, and White Community.
PUB DATE 1999-04-00
NOTE 49p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Quebec, Canada, April 19-23, 1999).
PUB TYPE Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Black Students; *Cultural Awareness; Cultural Differences; Educational Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; *Racial Discrimination; Racial Relations; *Resistance (Psychology); Student Attitudes; *Teacher Attitudes; Urban Youth; *Whites

ABSTRACT

This paper suggests that space and spatiality are major features of racial identity and the formation of student resistance. It brings together critical studies of "Whiteness," human territoriality, and theories of resistance in education. The problems between white teachers and students of color can be understood better through a combination of these three fields. A literature review of critical studies of whiteness suggests that what oppressed people of color need from whites is not sympathy so much as self-reflection and collective reflection on their own white privilege in a system of white racism. One of the most salient features of white racial identity is a denial of white privilege. People of color develop their own racial identities within a complex milieu of social encounters with whiteness. Critical studies of education have increasingly been concerned with resistance theory over the last few decades. Theories of resistance take as their main focus the perception that students are active constructors of culture rather than passive receivers. Students are also active spatial agents in school, in spite of the school's efforts at control. Academic achievement is not so much about cognitive abilities or skills acquisition as it is about how the territorial practices of teachers and others at a school create alienation, resistance, and community membership. Schools do not provide education that is inclusive of historically disenfranchised students because of the territoriality of whiteness. (Contains 47 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 434 168

THE HIDDEN CURRICULUM OF WHITENESS: WHITE TEACHERS, WHITE TERRITORY, AND WHITE COMMUNITY

by
Ricky Lee Allen
UCLA Graduate School of Education and Information Studies

Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting
of the American Educational Research Association
Montreal, Quebec, Canada
April 1999

Correspondence:
5837 Pickering Avenue, #301
Whittier, California 90601
(562)945-2516
rallen@ucla.edu

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ricky Lee Allen
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

UD 032097

The Hidden Curriculum of Whiteness: White Teachers, White Territory, White Community

The field of education is beginning to take a closer look at the issue of Whiteness. Many education scholars have already suggested that Whiteness creates a context for schooling that manifests into resistance by students of color. The links that have been made have been important in constructing a new discourse on race that identifies the realities of White racism and provides the possibility of transforming the relationships between White teachers and students of color.

However, the field of education, including those studying whiteness and student resistance, have paide little attention to space and spatiality. The critical study of space and spatial theory has been a hot topic of study in the social sciences for several years now. Yet, this spatial discourse has not made its way into to educational studies other than as an occasional add-on or superficial analysis. This paper argues that space and spatiality is a major feature of racial identity and the formation of student resistance. In so doing, it brings together three previously unrelated fields of inquiry: critical studies of Whiteness, human territoriality, and theories of resistance in education. A review of literature on these topics builds a framework that will enable us to see how the problems created by the interactions between White teachers and students of color can be better understood through a combination of these three fields as opposed to any one field by itself. My personal experience in

schools and scholarly studies leads me to believe that Whiteness, human territoriality, and resistance shape much of the interactions between White teachers and students of color in inner-city schools. Thus, my ultimate intention is to turn this literature review into an empirical study that will challenge my thoughts on space and race.

Whiteness and Racial Identity Development

Racism is a system of advantage based on race that institutionalizes the racial prejudice of the dominant racial group (Tatum, 1997; Wellman, 1977). This definition of racism requires more than an act of individual racial prejudice for racism to exist. Instead, racism exists when there is a system of policies, practices, processes, and rituals which confer privilege for one group, White people, and disprivilege for people of color. Certainly, many people of color are actively prejudice against Whites, but the social effects are minimal since White hold most of the institutional power and benefit most from this arrangement. The racial prejudice of Whites has very direct effects on the lives of people of color because Whites establish most of the rules and regulations of public space. If people of color are prejudice against one another, it does not change the system which privileges Whites and leaves other groups to be variously disprivileged within a White-dominated context (Tatum, 1997).

Many Whites and some people of color resist the definition of racism that I have described. They choose instead to see racism as individual acts of racial prejudice as opposed to structured processes which privilege Whites. The critical study of Whiteness has grown as a challenge to ideologies that resist a more structural view of White privilege. Alice McIntyre (1997b) defines Whiteness as "a system and ideology of white dominance that

marginalizes and oppresses people of color, ensuring existing privileges for white people in this country" (p. 3).[1] Her definition locates racism within the specificity of the production of White privilege and White racial identity. The study of White identity formation is essential since it is the social entity that harbors the unequal social value of being White in a system of White racism. Although the field of critical studies of Whiteness is not homogeneous, its proponents contend that the fight against Whiteness means that Whites need to intervene in the process which produce their White identity as privileged. Critical studies of Whiteness argues that what oppressed people of color need from Whites is not sympathy as much as a self- and collective-reflection on their own White privilege in a system of White racism. To assist in this process, a growing community of scholars are already engaged in an effort to define the properties of Whiteness and White racial identity.

One of the most salient features of White racial identity is a denial of White privilege. Whites typically do not see how they are socially privileged because they do not know much about the daily experiences of people of color. In a foundational piece on the study of Whiteness, Peggy McIntosh (1997) argues that Whites are often not aware of the invisible protections that they have as they move about the world. Since they are not conscious of their protections, they attribute their experiences and successes to simply being "human" rather than to being White. She makes the privileges of Whites concrete by offering 46 examples of everyday events that are experienced differently depending on whether one is White or a person of color. For example, Whites can more easily arrange to be in the company of people of

[1]Throughout this paper, I will capitalize the words "White" and "Black" when they refer to racial groups because that is the current APA guidelines. McIntyre did not capitalize White.

their own race than people of color. They can easily see people of their own race widely represented on TV and in the newspapers. They do not have to educate their children to be aware of systemic racism for their own daily physical protection. They are never asked to speak for all people in their racial group. They do not have to worry about the attitudes of their children's teachers towards their race. They are not taught to fear ignorance of the perspective and powers of people of other races. They can be sure that low job performance will not be attributed to their race. And, they are better able to dictate whether or not an issue is "racial" because their race lends them more credibility in the discussion. McIntosh's checklist of White privilege touches on just a few instances of so-called "normal" life that are understood differently depending on one's race.

Another salient feature of Whiteness is a racial perspective known as *colorblindness*. Colorblindness is racial strategy of ignoring or dismissing the influence of racism. It plays an important role in White racial identity because it fulfills the desire of Whites to appear non-racist while simultaneously dismissing the effects of Whiteness (McLaren, 1997). For most Whites, being called a racist is both devastating and rare. It is a term saved for only the most heinous of racial acts. The colorblindness of Whites is meant to act as a shield to deflect away racial criticism that might tarnish what they perceive to be their image as humane figures who are the embodiment of social goodwill (Gallagher, 1997). When Whites say that they do not see someone's "color" (i.e.-race), people of color take that to mean that Whites do not see the differences in their racialized experiences and positions in the world. Whites use colorblindness to suggest that they are promoting equality because they see people as individuals and not group members. They claim that they see everyone the same, but the effect is to not really see people

at all. Colorblindness is especially problematic when Whites invoke it in an attempt to exclude the topic of racism from a discussion. It is then a strategy to control race as an interpretive and analytical category and keep Whiteness unnamed and unexplored.

Colorblindness is related to how White teachers conceptualize their pedagogical roles. White teachers who adopt colorblindness as a racial strategy do not directly address systemic racism on a sustained and consistent basis in their classroom. They are more likely to ignore children's curiosity about their developing racial identities and treat their concerns in hushed or dismissive tones (Tatum, 1997). The normative culture of most schools accepts an avoidance of deep examinations of the role of racism and Whiteness in everyday life. Teachers who are colorblind are more likely to be accepted on a campus were being colorblind is the norm. Once on a colorblind campus, colorblind teachers are encouraged to promote a colorblind school culture in the daily classroom and school-wide activities. Those who choose a more "radical" strategy of developing a critical awareness of Whiteness in their students walk on shaky ground if they teach at a colorblind school. These rare White teachers may still be reluctant to discuss racism in a school culture that creates fear for those who resist colorblindness.[2]

Alice McIntyre's (1997a, 1997b) study of White teachers is one of the most thorough statements of White teacher's subjectivity to date. McIntyre explored the relationship between teaching and Whiteness with thirteen White female student teachers who were placed in inner-city schools. The participants recognized that Whiteness was likely to be an obstacle to their

---

[2]I should point out that there are K-12 schools, both public and private, that welcome teachers who wish to teach a critical approach to racism.

being able to effectively teach students of color. They were also worried about how they would be perceived by students of color. The participants used colorblindness as a means of coping with their fears of efficiency and racial visibility. Essentially, they wanted to be seen as "colorless" teachers whose race did not matter to the students, and thus would not interfere with their notion of being efficient teachers. McIntyre states that colorlessness was a code for the participants to say that they thought students would react negatively because they were White. Rather than dealing with what it means to be a White teacher, the participants simply wanted their race to be invisible. They also wanted race to be invisible in their classroom. They imagined their classrooms as safe-spaces free from the pressure of race, and certainly not as a place to "further burden" students of color with serious discussions of systemic racism.

Colorblindness, then, is a veiled strategy for promoting equality that in reality has the effect of making a place for Whiteness. Charles Gallagher (1997) contends that younger Whites are very conscious of their White racial identity. From his research of how White college students make sense of their Whiteness, Gallagher found that colorblindness is a conscious racial strategy used to promote the emerging political agenda of Whites. Though Whites often do not wish to discuss their own privilege, their recognition of and responses to broad social issues are replete with racial rhetoric and representative of a definite group identity, or "White community." White students perceive that the U.S. is now undergoing a "multicultural invasion" that is destroying what is otherwise a fair and just nation. They believe that people of color are or will be responsible for a lowered standard of living for Whites, a belief which is transformed into a fear of the racial and economic "Other." These White fears of material deprivation are ironically located in a

common victimization narrative whereby they believe that they are being unfairly attacked by governmental equity programs, such as Affirmative Action, whereas people of color are in a position to reap unjust benefits. The sentiments exhibited by Whites in Gallagher's study were confirmed in a larger sense with the passage of Proposition 209 (anti-affirmative action legislation) in California. Contradicting the typical construction of Whites as racially naive, Gallagher's research suggests a different trend.

> The majority of whites in this study have come to understand themselves and their interests as white. Many of my respondents now think about themselves as whites, not as ethnics; they see themselves as individuals who are members of a racial category with its own particular set of interests. They have attached new meanings to being white and have used those meanings as the basis for forging an identity centered around race. They have, to borrow Michael Omi and Howard Winant's term, gone through the process of racialization (Gallagher, 1997, p. 7).

The students in Gallagher's study expressed an interest in making a new White identity that is "nondemonized." One anti-demonization strategy they used was to represent the White race as simply "equal" to all other races, thus stripping away any sense of historical or material memory. In spite of the current realities of real oppression against people of color, Whites have developed an ideology of *aversive racism* (Tatum, 1997) which argues that we all now live in a utopia of equality, with one notable exception, that Whites are the oppressed class. They contend that true equality can be achieved by eliminating affirmative action, being blind to race, and wiping out "reverse racism" against Whites. Colorblindness from this subject location is seen as a way of promoting the agenda of White victimization, dismissing further criticisms of Whiteness, and presenting an image that Whites are humane for not wanting to refer to others in racial terms. In the decades since the civil rights movement, White have shifted racial discourse from making sure that

the oppressed are not left behind in our democracy to making sure that oppression is ignored as a factor in producing democratic reform.

Some Whites, like those in Gallagher's study, see themselves as part of a White racial community. Still others do not think of themselves as a member of a White group. Either way, the White identities of individuals are always constructed in relation to membership in a White community because all identities of the self are formed in distinction to group membership. For instance, the White community is a "fictive kinship" that regulates group membership and constructs community-related experiences. Imagined communities have limits as to who is and who is not a member (Anderson, 1991). Anderson contends that no community, and therefore, no nation, thinks of itself as inclusive of all human beings. Instead, there develops an imagined kinship amongst those identified as community "insiders" which has the effect of making the community and the nation seem natural and certain (hence the term "nation"). At the same time, the exclusion of "outsiders" is also naturalized and fixed. Beyond the borders of a community lies the territory of another community, the "Other" against which the community is understood. The imagined White community certainly is not co-terminus with all of humanity, although it believes itself to be. Many times Whites think of their experiences as universally human and imagine themselves and each other as "generic" people. The world as it is currently organized allows the to exist in it without problematizing their race as normative. In the U.S., Whites often ignore their race as an identity and opt instead to call themselves "American" when asked their race or ethnicity. This normative welding of Whiteness and Americanness correlates to the extreme sense of propriety that Whites have of the U.S. (Frankenberg, 1994). A propriety that continues to justify unearned advantages and confer racial

dominance. Whites rationalize their privilege by constructing themselves as benevolent patriarchs of the disadvantaged Others who struggle to keep pace. The systematic exclusion of people of color by White dominated institutions over the centuries has not seemed to phase the beliefs that Whites have in themselves. One thing is for sure, Whites are often quite naive about what people of color think about them. White silence on racism is most costly to people of color, but there are costs to Whites in that they invest in a system and ideology that is illusory for their desired goal of appearing "humane."

Members of the White community forms racial bonds through tests of Whites' commitment to White ideology. Christine Sleeter (1996) describes a feature of Whiteness called "White racial bonding" that acts to "affirm a common stance on race-related issues, legitimating particular interpretations of oppressed groups, and drawing we-they boundaries" (p. 216). For example, she tells the story of a conversation she had with a White neighbor whom she barely knew. Almost immediately after exchanging their greetings, the neighbor commented on how pleased she was that the federal government was "sending welfare mothers back to work." Knowing that many Whites interpret "welfare mothers" as a code for "lazy, single Black mothers," Sleeter told the neighbor that she did not agree with her assessment of welfare policy. Sleeter says that racial bonding amongst Whites often works through this type of discursive engagement around social issues, a tactic best described as *discursive baiting* (McLaren, Leonardo, & Allen, in press). Discursive baiting is a common interaction amongst Whites who are just getting acquainted. It begins with a simple exchange of pleasantries and quickly moves into a test of White solidarity. One of the consequences for giving the wrong answer to discursive bait is to have an extended, oddly antagonistic debate whereby the instigator, which I will refer to as the "White sentry," attempts to discipline

the logic of the resistor, which I will refer to as the "White infidel," and bring her back into the order of Whiteness. Of course, another possible consequence for a White infidel is to be socially shunned altogether and made an outsider to Whiteness, a state of affairs that is actually critical to the abolition of Whiteness.

In the racialization processes of Whiteness, White bodies take on the role of the material norm and serve as the standard for measuring the differentness of those who become identified as non-White (McLaren, 1997). The racialization of White identity occurs through the work of individual agents who monitor the normative borders of White identity. Take for example how Beverly Daniel Tatum (1997) describes the surveillance of Whiteness as represented in the video by Rosabeth Moss Kanter called *A Tale of O*:

> In corporate America, Black people are still in the *O* position. One consequence of being an *O*...is heightened visibility. When an *O* walks in the room, the *X*s [Whites] notice. Whatever the *O* does, positive or negative, stands out because of this increased visibility. It is hard for an *O* to blend in. When several *O*s are together, the attention of the *X*s is really captured. Without the tokens present in the room, the *X*s go about their business, perhaps not even noticing that they are all *X*s. But when the *O* walks in, the *X*s are suddenly self-conscious about their *X*-ness (p. 89).

This rather commonplace scenario depicts the pattern of social encounters in space between Black and Whites that has the effect of creating differing psychological spaces. Since Whites have more legitimacy in the corporate and educational world, interactions of White surveillance are more likely to have a negative psychological impact on Black people because of the historical legacy of discrimination and the current reality of exclusion. Whites often do not make much of these kinds of interactions because there are no serious

consequences of surveillance for them. Racial surveillance is just another aspect of assuring White privilege and conferring dominance.

These types of interactions with Whites in space is more than just psychologically hurtful, it is a driving force in the production of non-White racial identities. People of color develop their own racial identities within a complex milieu of social encounters with Whiteness. The representations of White people in the minds of people of color, assembled through interactions with Whiteness, is constitutive of the racial identities of people of color (hooks, 1992). Since public schools are staffed primarily by Whites, they act as a location which provides the memories and experiences for the development of oppositional Black identity. In William Cross's (1991) model of Black racial identity development, the Black child passes through five stages: *pre-encounter, encounter, immersion/emersion, internalization,* and *internalization-commitment*. The Black child begins life in a pre-encounter stage, not yet having had social experiences that she recognizes as related to race. Children at this early elementary school age are more likely to play with children of other races than older children, so homogenous racially grouping is not common on the playgrounds or cafeteria unless the school is homogeneous. Black children in the pre-encounter stage have not learned to distinguish themselves from other human beings. Instead, they consider themselves to be the same racially as other people their age.

Beginning in the middle school years, the encounter stage marks a crisis in Black children's recognition of their racial location relative to Whiteness. By this point in their lives, many Black children have accumulated memorable encounters with Whites and the White world. Their memories of encounters with Whiteness cause them to question their previous notion of themselves as racially non-distinct human beings.

Having experienced White teaching staffs who put them in lower tracks, misread their cultural codes, ignore the history of their people, and silence their perspectives and lived experiences, Black children come to the realization that society sees them in ways that other people are not seen. Of course, this is an unsettling and alienating discovery that commonly leads to Black children seeking out others who share similar views. Within their newly formed peer support groups, they begin to construct a Blackness which is directly antagonistic to Whiteness. A typical feature of Blackness in the encounter stage is to equate academic success with "acting White" and academic resistance as "acting Black" (Ogbu, 1992).[3] Many Black adolescents and other adolescents of color form racial identity groups on school campuses that represent a making of alternative places for their developing Black self-concept. These alternative places usually arise in the more open and low-surveillance spaces of the school, like the cafeteria. It is very common to see same-race groups assembled together, separate from other same-race groups, in the open spaces of integrationist schools all across the country.

The next stages in Black identity development produce a social persona that engages the world as a social justice representative of the imagined Black community. First of all, during the immersion/emersion stage, Black identity development moves from an anger toward Whites to an intense engagement with Blackness itself. Black people immerse themselves in the symbols, history, and narratives of Black culture. Anger at Whites is still present, but it is not the first priority during immersion. Those in the immersion stage form close-knit groups with those going through the same

---

[3]Unfortunately, this does not have to be the case. The curriculum of most public schools is hostile to Black knowledge and wisdom. Students do not get an opportunity to see that high-levels of learning is connected to Black identity for many Black people. For example, there are many Afrocentric programs, such as at Berkeley High School in Berkeley, California, that gives students a chance to engage in the intellectual rigor of Black points of view.

process of developing a deep understanding of their racial identity. Discourse within the group is a cultural production which works to recode the world through the structures of Blackness. Another function of immersion groups is to challenge the racism that its members have internalized. Outsiders are rarely welcomed into the group, especially if they are not of the same race. The groups act as spaces of recovery, or homeplaces, that are both survival mechanisms and crucibles for the organization of the Black public sphere. At the end of this intense immersion experience, one emerges with a positive sense of Black racial identity. The internalization stage finds the Black individual at ease with their Blackness and more comfortable with forming relationships with those of other racial communities. Individuals at this stage are still outraged by racism, but have acquired cultural skills which give them confidence that they can resist the internalization of stereotypes and retain a positive sense of their Blackness. They also are have come to terms with the fact that this will be an ongoing struggle in their lives as long as Whiteness is so pervasive. The last stage is internalization-commitment. This phase moves the internalization process from an individualistic orientation to a broader commitment to the imagined Black community. Individuals in the commitment stage are interested in social justice and use whatever social status they can acquire to lift up everyone in the Black community.

Up to this point, I have represented White people in rather essentialistic terms with the explicit intention of naming the structure and consequences of Whiteness. I want to turn next to the possibility of White anti-racist agency. Whites who are actively anti-racist serve as evidence that other Whites can be transformed through a critical pedagogy of Whiteness that first recognizes the existence of a multiplicity of White racial identities

(Giroux, 1997). Janet Helms (1990) provides a useful model for evaluating the development of a "healthy" White racial identity that works against White privilege and with people of color.[4] Her model is particularly focused on Whites who come into institutional contact with people of color, such as White teachers in the inner city, and are inexperienced with face-to-face racial interactions. The social psychology of Whiteness sees that the development of a healthy White racial identity is impeded by the White individual's understanding that racism only consists of isolated and individual acts rather than general conditions working at cultural and institutional levels (Tatum, 1997).

The first three levels of Helm's model are *contact, disintegration,* and *reintegration.* Together they represent the initial process of abandoning racism and recognizing White privilege. In the contact stage, Whites do not acknowledge the existence of institutional racism. They might accept that individual acts of racism occur, or they may even deny that racism exists in any form. Although the person knows that they are White, they are not aware of themselves as a racialized human being with daily racial experiences. Most Whites in this stage construct themselves as colorblind and racially neutral. The person in the contact stage is a passive racist because he or she receives the privilege of Whiteness, but does not see their own role in the creation of the institutionalized racism that constructs their privilege (Carter, 1997; Tatum, 1997). In the disintegration stage, intimate contact with people of color and/or their stories of struggle causes Whites to rethink racism as a current reality. Colorblindness no longer appears to be valid as

---

[4]Describing White racial identity development with the term "healthy" situates the social psychology of Whiteness as a project to correct the dysfunctions of Whiteness. The term "healthy" implies that there are "unhealthy" White racial identities. The racism of Whiteness is positioned as a type of psychological maladjustment which needs corrective measures.

the White individual realizes that they are racially distinct in ways that have systemic effects. They experience emotional conflict as they become torn between defying and denying Whiteness. Moving in and out of favor with Whiteness, they begin to notice the rules that regulate membership in the White community. Their previous sense of self is shattered when they come to the realization that their so-called "individuality" is not free and autonomous but rather constructed in relationship to a White racial community. In this stage, Whites criticize the idea that society is an open meritocracy where all people regardless of race have an equal chance to succeed. However, they are also likely to adapt cultural deprivation views of people of color which perpetuates their hold on membership in the "superior" White community (Carter, 1997). During reintegration, the individual's cultural racism is in conflict with their new found awareness of institutional racism. The person may be directly working with people of color, such as in an inner city school, but still harbor feelings that people of color would be better off if they adopted White ways. Since they have gained some awareness of racist discourse and its effects on the emotions of people of color, Whites in reintegration may be reluctant to openly express these deeply held beliefs. Without a significant event to expose and challenge a White individual in this stage, the development of an actively anti-racist identity is hindered (Carter, 1997).

The next three levels--pseudo-independence, immersion-emersion, and autonomy--indicate a move toward a White identity that actively intervenes in institutional racism (Carter, 1997). In pseudo-independence, the White person has decided to abandon racism, but does not have the appropriate means for doing so. Rather than looking for strategies that other Whites have developed for countering Whiteness, the person turns to people

of color for solutions. The person increases contact with people of color while keeping a distance from the racism of other Whites. Even if the person gains access to friendships with people of color, the White person's interactions in the relationship is constrained by their feelings of guilt and shame about their Whiteness. Whites stricken with guilt are guarded against speaking or acting in ways that they think will be perceived as White, and are therefore distanced from people of color as well as Whites (Tatum, 1997).[5] Also, the person still believes that they can best help people of color by teaching them how to succeed in the White world, and thus "solve" racism (Carter, 1997). Whites who are able to understand that racism is essentially a White problem have entered the immersion-emersion phase. In this stage, the person comes to realize that they can best help people of color by working to transform other White people. The person turns to other Whites who are already engaged in the challenge of intervening in the production of White privilege and immerse themselves in an anti-racist White community (Helms, 1990). They envision people of color as having great wisdom and ingenuity to succeed in spite of racism and draw strength from their courage. They also actively seek out the criticisms of Whiteness by people of color so that they can better understand the privileges of Whiteness. Whites emerge from this stage with the belief that they can be White and anti-racist, while also resisting other forms of structural oppression. Autonomy is the last phase. In autonomy, the person is able to see others as both unique individuals and members of differentially privileged racial groups. The person is able to move in and out of exchanges with people of color and Whites in ways that

[5]The term "guilty White liberal" is closely associated with the pseudo-independent stage. They may be troubled by conservative meritocratic discourses, but are not connected in significant ways to people of color. They retain their distance and privilege, and thus, their image of humaneness and benevolence.

are meaningful to all involved. The individual has achieved confidence in dealing with the potential uncertainties of race (Helms, 1990).

White teachers are at various stages of the White racial identity development. Nevertheless, their jobs require that they interact regularly with students of color in inner-city schools all across the country. Needless to say, their stage of identity development is not a criteria for employment. The problem of Whiteness poses some serious educational questions. For instance, how does the racial identity development of White teachers affect their interactions with students of color? Some theoretical studies have looked at the difference that race makes in terms of the cultural styles of White teachers and teachers of color (see Delpit, 1995). Some theoretical studies have contemplated how the role of a "critical White educator" might differ from that of a Latino educator (see Darder, 1993). Some empirical studies have been conducted on how White teachers construct their White racial identity relative to their pedagogical role (see McIntyre, 1997a), but these studies were not conducted at the school site. No empirical studies to date have examined how White teachers actively surveil Whiteness as part of constructing their White racial identities vis-a-vis their role as teacher within the physical context of a school. Whiteness needs to be studied as it is practiced in order to generate theory which will assist in the transformation of White teachers' racial identities. In particular, we need to know more about how White teachers make places for their White racial identities at the school site.

Territoriality and Identity

In some people's minds, territoriality is associated with a display of animalistic aggression to protect a certain space. This view is synonymous

with the model of territoriality developed to explain animal behavior (Soja, 1971). In this model, territoriality is represented as a basic strategy to ensure survival by guarding basic needs like food, water, and mates. This biological discourse on territoriality conjures up images of wild dogs who instinctively defend their territory against intruders. Another conceptualization of territoriality is focuses on the politics of humans. In this perspective, territoriality refers to a nation-state's control of "its" space. These two common conceptualizations of territoriality limit the possibilities of seeing the importance of human territoriality in our daily lives. They cast human territoriality is an occasional aggressive act by irrational, mean-spirited, or very needy people. But, more recent studies of territoriality relate it to the everyday cultural and institutional processes that organizes power for particular communities. These studies situate territoriality as a core feature of human interactions that is as basic to issues of human compliance and conflict as communication, economics, or culture.

One major aspect of human territoriality is that it is the study of spatial behavior. Many recent social theories have avoided studies of behavior for fear of being associated with positivistic behaviorism. However, behavior is an intricate aspect of human existence that cannot go unexamined. Behavior is something that we all notice about each other all throughout our daily lives. Thus, we develop conceptualizations of behavior whether we study it as a curricular discipline or not. The key is not to avoid studying behavior, but rather to articulate a theory of behavior that challenges the ideologies and ideological practices that guide the construction of privilege and power through the control of human interactions. Territoriality moves toward a critical theory of behavior because it emphasizes the link between behavior, identity, and power. Soja (1971) defines territoriality as "a behavioral

phenomenon associated with the organization of space into spheres of influence or clearly demarcated territories which are made distinctive and considered at least partially exclusive by their occupants or definers" (p. 19). The implication of his definition is that territoriality works as a normalization of human behavior through regulating the surveillance of presence and absence, entry and exit, and inside and outside of a given area (Soja, 1996). For example, the video *A Tale of O*, which I described in the previous section, shows how Whiteness is a behavioral phenomenon of racialized gazes. When a Black person enters the space where the Whites are, the Black person is surveilled. If an attentive observer is watching this phenomenon for signs of territoriality, she might notice the turning heads of Whites, the lingering of their gazes, and maybe even some nervous fidgeting. Through the presence of Blackness in their White territory, Whites notice their own Whiteness and display behavioral responses.

In one of the few books on human territoriality, Robert David Sack (1986) agrees that territoriality is "a form of spatial behavior." He adds that spatial behavior is shaped by the conceived plans for controlling a territory. These territorial plans are linguistic codes that structure the spatial behavior of those who will develop and maintain the territory. Thus, Sack sees territoriality as not just spatial behavior, but as a material and discursive "strategy" of control by individuals or groups. He defines territoriality as "a spatial strategy to affect, influence, or control resources and people, by controlling area" (p. 1).[6] A "controlled area," or territory, is the geographical area whose "boundaries are used by some authority to mold, influence, or

[6]At least, this is the first definition of territoriality that he offers. I am using this version because I think it captures the heart of human territoriality in a concise manner. Later in his book, Sack defines territoriality as "the attempt by an individual or group to affect, influence, or control people, phenomena, and relationships, by delimiting and asserting control over a geographic area" (Sack, 1986, p. 19).

control activities" (Sacks, 1986; p. 19). Territoriality is often envisioned through the military metaphor of enemies doing battle along a material border. The invader is trying to penetrate the physical boundary whereas the defender is trying to prevent physical penetration by the invader. However, most human territories do not necessitate that only community members are inside of the physical boundaries of the territory and non-members are outside. Territorial defenders can carry with them the ideas and power of the boundary, or border, to other territories. Also, non-members can reside within the physical domain of the territory and still be excluded through the discursive borders of group membership. What this notion of territory suggests is that a space is not necessarily a territory unless it is perceived to have boundaries that determine social authority and community membership. Although the border of a territory may lie at the edge of an area in a physical sense, it is at the center of a territory in the subjective sense of demarcating the normative ordering of people, things, and relationships.

Territoriality is a complex geographical phenomenon that operates through a multitude of processes. Sack (1986) lists ten modalities of human territoriality that produces power and controls spatial behavior. Territoriality makes and marks objects as belonging to particular groups. It communicates ownership and exclusion of categorized objects through boundary markers or signs. It is used as a strategy of control when objects are perceived to be both controllable and in need of control. It provides a means for the reification of power by making the spatial plans of the privileged explicit and visible while hiding the spatial desires and visions of the dominated. It can mask relationships of power by attributing exclusion and privilege to the nature of a particular place rather than the social interactions which produce and maintain that place. It constructs institutionally-contrived relationships,

such as "teacher" and "student," that deflect deeper emotional commitments. It obscures the competition for resources and relationships in space by naturalizing particular modes of place-making and place-clearing while denigrating others. It creates imagined frames or containers which spatially isolate human activities to particular places. It constructs the perception that some places are empty or emptiable when in fact they are inhabited by social values and knowledge. And, it works to structure new territorialities for it is both space-destroying and space-producing.

Michel Foucault (1977) provides a framework for seeing the mechanisms of territoriality at the micro-geopolitical level. He was interested in why people comply with the dominant order, in other words, why they subject themselves to the discipline of the privileged and powerful. In his theory of *panopticism*, territorial surveillance, whether real or imagined, constructs discipline at the level of individual agents. The hegemony of discipline is enacted in through the "trap" of visibility shaped by the everyday rituals of seeing and being seen. The marginalized are those who are always seen, but cannot return the gaze without consequence. The dominant are powerful because their symbols of power are always in full view, yet they themselves are often hidden from sight. The marginalized never know whether they are really being surveilled or not because the powerful are able to move in and out of the panoptic situation. One of the effects is that the symbols of power become a type of monitoring device even though they are non-human. For instance, a person might drive more cautiously when they know that they are near a police station even though no police car is in sight. In a school, a teacher might step out in the hall to talk to someone. Depending on the type of territoriality practiced by the teacher, the students might watch the door for signs of the teacher's return. The door, symbolic of

the teacher's power to enter and exit the room as she chooses, becomes a vicarious object of surveillance. The teacher could never control the students by herself if they really wanted to run out of the door. Yet, they remain in their seats because they know where they are (i.e.-in a school classroom), who they are (i.e.-students), and what lies beyond the door (i.e.-punishment) even though the enforcers are not physically present in the room. Foucault referred to the subjective condition of learned compliance within the hegemony of surveillance as *governmentality*. The governmentalities of members of the privileged group are subjectivities guided by ideological codes which recognize and discipline the bodies of others, that is, which assign classifications to them and manipulate their distribution in space. Governmentality also represents how individual agents are logically and emotionally invested in a self-regulation that is constructed out of a sense of being constantly visible to the dominant group. Since individuals are always group members of some kind, governmentalities are representative of membership in imagined communities and structure surveillance according to the making and marking of bodies and objects.

Foucault's notion of *heterotopia* is another important concept for understanding territoriality. In contrast to a utopia, which is an imagined place that does not exist in reality, heterotopia are the "other spaces" of real human social interactions (Foucault, 1986; Soja, 1996). To demonstrate, Foucault uses the metaphor of the mirror. Standing in front of a mirror, a person sees their image, but the image that they see does not really exist inside of the glass of the mirror. The image in the mirror is like a utopia in that the vision seems clear, but it is not and will never be real. Although the images in the mirror are not real in and of themselves, the mirror does provide the on-looker with an approximation of reality by giving her a sense

of place in the world that is relational to other objects. If the on-looker walks backwards, that change in location is accounted for in the mirror by showing her her position relative to other objects. If the person walks off to the side, her absence is noted in the mirror. By seeing and not seeing the surfaces of others in the mirror, the on-looker comes to know their situatedness within a certain spatial context. Foucault (1986) states that "we do not live inside a void,...we live inside a set of relations that delineates sites which are irreducible to one another and absolutely not superimposable on one another" (p. 23). The mirror as heterotopia brings ourselves into view only as we relate ourselves to other people, other things, and other sites. We come into being as we look into the mirror. Foucault's heterotopia is much like *A Tale of O* in that Whites notice themselves as White when people of color are present. For Whites, people of color represent the other images in the mirror where their Whiteness comes into view to themselves through their gaze upon the bodies of people of color. Heterotopias are similar to territories in that membership and codes of conduct are socially constructed through the surveillance of others (Soja, 1996). Entry and exit, opening and closing, and isolation and penetration drives the spatial practices of interactions within a heterotopia.

Henri Lefebvre (1991) argues that power is constructed through the processes of *social space*, a space both related to and distinct from material and mental spaces. Social space is the place where the social relationships between material and mental spaces are forged, fixed, and naturalized. Lefebvre breaks social space into three moments. The first moment, spatial practice, is the space of the mundane habits of everyday spatial behavior and experience. Spatial practice consists of the spatial interactions that are perceived as "normal" and whose rules and regulations are known to those

who have experienced it. It is the space that is considered to be "reality," or *real space*, and can be concretely sensed. The second moment of social space is the metaphorical imaginings of space called *representations of space.* Representations of space are the significations of the social and spatial world that are coded through the metaphors contained in all language (see Lakoff & Johnson, 1980) and harbored in mental or imagined spaces. As knowledge, representations of space are legitimized through cultural and institutional processes, making some representations of space seem valid and others invalid. Lefebvre's "representations of space" is an ideological space where the battle for subjectivity is waged and authorship is won by those who also have the material means necessary for domination. The third moment of social space is *spaces of representation* (Soja, 1996). Spaces of representation are the spaces that are lived in subordination to socially legitimated representations of space. Spaces of representation consist of the symbols and images which seek to represent lived experience that is both produced and excluded by normalized spatial practices and the conceptualizations which mask their fracturing effects. Spaces of representation are lived spaces that are not always readily verbalized, and may never be completely brought to the realm of discourse, or, that is, to representations of space. Identities emerge as spaces of representation are made into counterspaces which offer an important place from which to recover from and resist against the dominant socio-spatial order (Soja, 1996). In short, spaces of representation are crucibles for identity and oppositional politics.

Although both Foucault and Lefebvre pay a lot of attention to space, they do not devote much attention to the theorization of place. Place is the spatial form that seeks to secure a stable sight for identity (Keith & Pile, 1993). The struggle for place is also a territorial struggle for identity. The phrase "I

feel out of place" indicates the common experience of identity and territoriality in everyday life. The strategy adopted by many people of color is to re-territorialize a sense of identity through simultaneously constructing a sense of place. Of course, Whites do this also, but they do it with the help of the power and privileges already captured in the territories of Whiteness. One of the most informative definitions of place that connects it to identity is offered by Steve Pile (1996) who describes it as the "contact zone between physical reality, the social context, shared meanings and the self" (p. 54). Identity construction both sustains and is produced by the development of place through community-specific spatial practices and shared representations of space. For marginalized groups to counter the onslaught of oppression, they must be able to author places, as subjects of geography and history, that are resistant to domination (hooks, 1990). Haymes (1995) argues that the spaces of the inner city where Blacks reside are places where Black identity and Black community politics have been forged within and against the oppression of Whiteness. Haymes (1995) states that "[s]ince cultural identity is associated with and organized around territory, [urban renewal] disrupts black identity formation by destroying the material basis of the black public sphere" (p. 125).

Empirical studies of territoriality as they relate to the roles of actors within social institutions are rare. The best and most recent example of research on territoriality is Steve Herbert's *Policing Space* (1997), which is a study of the Wilshire Division of the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD). Herbert, following Sack's definition of territoriality, contends that the crux of power for the police is their ability to control and clear space. The efficacy of a police officer is rooted in their territorial capacity to establish places where they can regulate behavior through displays of force. Police officers socially

construct what is normal for various locations within their territory, and then they react to spatial activities which are viewed through this normative order. In other words, the cultural geography of officers represents an uneven application of legal force across space. For instance, LAPD officers identified places within the Wilshire Division as either "pro-police" or "anti-police" depending on how they were read against the normative order of safety. In pro-police areas, officers were more likely to relax and be patient with people. However, officers were much more on guard in anti-police areas. They looked at spatial actors with great suspicion and responded to perceived threats with aggressive force in anti-police areas. The normative order of safety was used to justify their differential and locational methods of policing.

Although Herbert shows how territoriality is practiced and conceptualized at an everyday level, his framework does not account for differences in community membership amongst officers, thus limiting his notion of structure and agency. He states that his purpose for examining police territoriality is to look at the ways that the power of the state is culturally and institutionally enacted across space. What I do not get a sense of is why this is an issue for Herbert? Why study state institutions if they are not problematic? The state is only problematic in that its reproduction structures inequalities of race, class, and gender. These classifications of oppression are glaringly missing from his analysis. The police are not represented as members of racial communities, rather they are depicted as part of the LAPD community. The chapter that comes the closest to an analysis of oppression describes the normative order of "adventure/machismo," but he does not tie his analysis into theoretical critiques of masculinity. Throughout most of the text, the LAPD officers are

cast as an encapsulated community void of membership in raced, classed, or gendered communities. The officers may have had a general cultural geography that placed some common constraints on their agency, but that does not mean that officers of color, for example, do not see those normative orders as an aspect of the Whiteness of the police force. Likewise, Herbert does not delve into how White officers read the bodies and spaces of people of color different than those of mostly White communities. Herbert prefigures the raced, classed, and gendered body as irrelevant to the issues of territorial surveillance, opting instead for the surfaces which indicate "police" and "not police." These signifiers alone do not explain why the officers felt more relaxed in "pro-police" areas and what that means in terms of the racial identity formations of police officers. For example, how is the territoriality of White police officers, that is, their making and marking of space, constitutive of their enacting and constructing their White identities?

Which leads to another limitation of Herbert's study. He did not collect data on the spatial practices and representations of space from the perspective of non-police officers. What is the image of police officers in the minds of people in "anti-police" areas (who are most likely people of color)? In what sense is the "anti-policeness" of an area related to its production as a counter-territoriality that embodies a place for the assembly of identities which contest Whiteness? In other words, a theory of resistance is lacking in his analysis and makes it difficult to locate the politics of police territoriality in a local, regional, or nation context. He makes the police subjects of territoriality while leaving the surveilled "Others" as passive objects. Territorialities can exist within the territorialities of others, although they are rarely superimposable. For instance, Erving Goffman (1961) noted in a study of asylums that even patients who seemingly had nothing still protected the

small space on the floor that they had to sleep on (Sitton, 1980). Herbert's work would have benefited from positioning the surveilled Others as territorial agents as well. This also would have meant that his normative orders would have been challenged by issues of race and class if the raced and classed people in anti-police areas were given bodies and voices capable of social and spatial productions. A representation of their lived, perceived, and conceived spaces would have added much more to Herbert's geography than the mere objectifying signifier of "anti-police area."

Previous definitions of territoriality have not gone far enough in representing the relationship between territory and identity. Making this adjustment to Sack's definition, I define territoriality as *a socially-constructed strategy of spatial control practiced by individuals of one group in order to affect, influence, or control individuals of either the same or another group.* By invoking the phrase "individuals *of* one group," I am suggesting that individuals act as agents of territorial surveillance for the community in which they are a member, whether they are actively conscious of this fact or not. I also indicate that this surveillance can be directed at individuals who are of the same imagined community. I define counter-territoriality as *a socially-constructed strategy of spatial control practiced by individuals of a marginalized group in order to affect, influence, and resist individuals of the dominant group and affect, influence, and organize individuals of the same or other marginalized group(s).* Counter-territoriality works to organize resistance against and engagement with dominant groups. It is best practiced when territorial alliances can be built amongst marginalized communities that live the consequences of disprivilege in the territories of the dominant.

In my analysis of territoriality, I am suggesting that there is a dialectic between territoriality and community. The territoriality-community dialectic

suggests that all places represent a struggle between community members for power and space. Schools are no exception. The psychological impact of being confronted by an alienating culture has being a primary emphasis of theories of resistance in education for some time now. But, do they adequately theorize the relationship between territory and community? The next section provides and over-view of resistance theory and analyzes its spatial elements.

Theories of Resistance in Education

Critical studies of education have taken a turn over the last few decades toward resistance theory. Theories of resistance, constructed as oppositions to and modifications of theories of reproduction, take as their main focus the perception that students are active constructors of culture rather than passive receivers of it. Following an orthodox Marxist interpretation, reproduction theorists of the 1970's were interested in how schools function in the reproduction of class inequalities. They contended that schooling mechanisms such as funding inequities, private and public school distinctions, and tracking reproduced social class (McLaren, 1994). Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis (1976) argued that schools reproduce class because there exists a correspondence between important social categories like class, race, and family background. One of the main assumptions of their theory was that occupational success, the symbol social mobility in a capitalist society, hinges upon an individual's personality traits, self-presentation, ascriptive characteristics, and level of educational attainment (Spring, 1996). These four qualities were also seen as being connected to the social class of an individual's family background. Bowles and Gintis translated these assumptions about class reproduction into the idea that working-class

students attend working-class schools that model the assembly lines of factories. Middle-class students attend middle-class schools that model places for the development of managerial or creative thinking (Anyon, 1980). Although reproduction theorists made great progress in calling attention to the role of schooling in creating broad patterns of inequality, their critics have expose their analyses as being overly deterministic. Their inattention to cultural processes meant that they failed to expose the everyday processes that give life to the reproduction of class. Also, they had a difficult time accounting for those students who do cross the boundaries of social class (Giroux, 1983; McLaren, 1994).

Emerging from neo-Marxist traditions, theories of resistance suggest that students are not "cultural dopes" who oblige every command of school officials (Spring, 1996). Teachers, for instance, are well aware that students are not always willing participants in the activities of schooling. Resistance theorists take this fact into account. They do not see the school as merely a machine that forges students into their class molds as if they were iron ore being turned into steel. Instead, they see schools as culturally-driven spaces of human interaction that have the effect of developing conformist or resistant student personas. According to one of the main assumptions of resistance theory, resistant students are actively marginalized and alienated by the normative order of the school culture. In response, these students construct behaviors and knowledge that directly opposes what they understand to be the explicit and implicit rules of social interaction (Willis, 1977). Students who are members of communities that have not succeeded in traditional schooling, historically speaking, are the most likely kinds of students who are alienated by the assimilationist cultures of schools that neither includes nor privileges their own ways of seeing and knowing the world (Giroux, 1983).

Resistance theories contend that inner-city teachers read the behaviors and discourses of students as being dysfunctional or maladaptive rather than as being an act of cultural resistance. Resistant students are sometimes isolated as individual outcasts, but many times they form groups with other students who are critical of the dominant culture of the school. They tend to seek out alternative identities which may coalesce in small school communities whose perspectives, behaviors, and desires run counter to the dominant objectives of the school. Like reproduction theorists, resistance theorists are morally and politcally committed to the problems of systemic oppression. However, resistance theorists are interested in understanding the cultural and institutional interactions which might lead to actual pedagogies and policies that are transformative.

In *Theory and Resistance in Education,* Henry Giroux (1983) outlines three premises of resistance theory. Although Giroux does not specifically relate resistance to territoriality, I will connect his premises to some of the ideas about territoriality that I have developed thus far. First, Giroux states that any analysis of schools as institutions must be situated within a socio-economic context. I take this to mean that schools are situated within larger social and economic geographies of race, class, and gender which must always be connected to the seemingly isolated events of schooling. Second, schools are places where political struggles are acted out through the construction and control of discourse, meaning, and subjectivities. This premise, I believe, represents the territoriality of discursive space that is a quality of schooling. Students and teachers engage in cultural battles in the classroom over the borders of legitimate knowledge. Students actively construct meaning as a consequence of engagement with the classroom environment. Those meanings may or may not conform to the intended interpretations of the

explicit curriculum. Students who tend to construct non-conformist meanings are likely to translate their ideological differences into acts of resistance which are counter-territorial in nature. Third, classroom practices are organized by the politics of commonsense values and beliefs. As a social construction, commonsense is normative to and of the community which has territorial control of curriculum and pedagogy. Both teachers and students can be governed by commonsense to create a state of governmentality which surveils classroom discourse and social interactions. Commonsense is achieved when representations of space and spatial practice reach an illusory place of naturalness, fixity, and normalcy. Of course, commonsense is problematic in that it works to both produce and exclude individuals of groups who are not privileged members of the "common," that is, dominant group.[7] Additionally, Giroux notes that not just any non-conformist behavior constitutes resistance. The resistor has to have some awareness of their own moral and political indignation at the oppressive structures of school culture and society in general.

In one of the few attempts to connect territoriality and resistance to a reading of schools, Thad Sitton (1980) applied the ideas of Erving Goffman to the surveillance of students. He was interested in uncovering the hidden rules that govern the interactions between human and non-human presences within school space. Although he does not explicitly state that he is studying territoriality, he attention to surveillance can be understood as being related to territoriality. School buildings are "high surveillance contexts" that tightly regulate entry and exit (one only has to look at the high fences and razor wire around most LAUSD schools to know this is the case). Once inside the

[7]Although, I suppose that their can be a type of "critical commonsense" which is contingently and strategically formulated as part of identity construction in counter-territories (e.g.- liberation nationalisms, Black public sphere).

building, surveillance continues at high levels. The hallways are wide, straight, and open avenues of transportation that are built to take students from one classroom cubicle to the next. Long, clean lines of sight make hallways perfect for surveilling students, particularly during class times when the hallways are mostly clear of students. Inside the classrooms, space is typically arranged so that students are seated in rows of chairs that face the place occupied by the teacher. Some spaces at a school, such as the principals office and teachers lounge, are constructed as off limits to students. Nevertheless, students are active spatial agents at school in spite of the high surveillance of boundaries and arrangements. Students come to learn the surveillance geography of the school and seek out the areas of lowest surveillance, such as bathrooms and parking lots, which provide openness for the development of student counter-culture. Interactions in these areas are liminal in nature and are usually avoided by the more colonized students. Some students transform low surveillance areas into places where they assert their opposition to the institution. Other examples of students spatialities is their limited territorial claims to their lockers and the space immediately around their seats in a classroom. However, Sitton contends that the school is ultimately in control of all of its spaces since even the students' lockers and classroom seats can be taken over by school personnel. Lockers can be searched for safety concerns and seats can be reassigned for almost no reason whatsoever. In fact, Sitton found that the school's control over its spaces was the very basis for identifying students for disciplinary procedures. Student defiance of normative spatial practices was considered a serious threat to school authority and was usually met with harsh punishment. For instance, if a student refused a teacher's request to change seats or to leave an area, they were usually suspended.

Sitton's article is suggestive of a notion of resistance, but he does not actually use the term "resistance" nor does he tie a theory of resistance to curriculum and culture as strongly as other resistance theorists do. He also casts students as a-historical subjects without a voice. Students in his piece are individual actors with no rational purpose for resistance other than to avoid surveillance. He offers no extended analysis of the connections between race, class, and gender and the distribution of bodies, materials, and relationships around the school space. He conducted his research as an "observational field study" which did not delve deeply into the identities and spatialities of teachers or students.

One of the most influential ethnographies in education that did account for the perspectives of resistant students is *Learning to Labour* (1977) by Paul Willis. It is a profoundly important work because it connects the emergence of resistance cultures in social institutions to the hegemonic reproduction of social class in a capitalist system. His argument is that resistance arises from a critique of class relations, but without the organization of resistance into a collective movement the consequence of resistance is reproduction. Willis conducted an ethnography of an all male and White school in an industrial city in England. The students were both middle and working class. Willis followed the interactions between two groups of students: the "ear-'oles" and "lads." The lads were working-class students who rejected the school curriculum and its associated interactions because they thought it was irrelevant to their existence. In its place, they developed a counter-school culture of disruption, laughter, and pranks directed at school officials and the ear-'oles, a culture similar to that played out on the shop floors where their male relatives work. Representing the middle class, the ear-'oles were the students who conformed to the practices

of the school. The lads constructed them as passive receivers of school culture--information went in one ear and out of the other, hence the name "ear-'oles." Focusing on the subjectivities of the lads, Willis saw the lads as having insights into schooling's social function of replicating their working-class positions. The lads did see schooling as a means of economic opportunity for exceptional individuals from working-class backgrounds, but not for their social class as a whole. The potential for economic gain was not great enough to make the lads sacrifice their culture of resistance and conform to the achievement ideology of the school. Since the lads were familiar with the nature of employment in their local, manufacturing-oriented environment, they realized that the curriculum of the school was far removed from the experience of manual labor. Willis, as well other scholars familiar with his work, note that the lads' recognition of their collective disenfranchisement from educational and economic opportunity suggest the potential for engaging them in the organization of a class movement (MacLeod, 1987).

However, the lads' resistance was left unattended and turned into a fatalistic acceptance of their class position. The lads constructed mental work as feminine and physical work as masculine. Not surprisingly then, they saw the ear-'oles as effeminate because they complied with the mental work of the schools. The implications of disidentifying with mental work makes any attempt at consciousness-raising difficult, at best. Instead of mental work, the lads embraced a macho culture of manual labor, which was expressed both inside of school (e.g.-harassing other students and ignoring school work) and outside of school (e.g.-repairing automobiles). Ultimately, they chose jobs that matched their macho, working-class identities, thus reproducing the class structure. The hegemony of social class is evident in the lads resistant, yet

compliant, assimilation into the social location of labor. Prominent anthropologist George Marcus (1986) that Willis captures the "irony that a cultural form created from resistance to dominant class indoctrination in the school becomes the adaptive means of accommodation to factory life" (p. 174). Guided by the dominant ideology of the middle class, the ear-'oles claim to privilege in the curriculum of the school went unchallenged. The lads and their working-class experiences and ideologies were both produced and excluded by the processes of schooling.[8] Furthermore, no cultural and institutional mechanisms were available to transform the lads' resistance into collective engagement with the production of hegemony in their school or future work sites. The lads never had the opportunity to learn that learning itself, mental work, could be very relevant to their everyday struggles as representatives of the working class. Through Willis' interpretation of the lads, we come to see the school not as the conscious villain that correspondence theorists make it out to be. Nor do we see students as passive victims. Instead, what we see is the school culture in conflict with the culture of the working class, which has as a consequence the construction and reproduction of working class identities (Spring, 1996). In the end, Willis shows us the immense investment that the lads have in their counter-school culture and that pedagogical attempts to transform their resistance into engagement will first have to go through their working-class desires, values, needs, and experiences.

In the two decades since *Learning to Labour* was published, several influential critical ethnographies of schools have been released. Peter

---

[8]After all, being working class is more than simply the experience of the time spent on the job. Part of the experience of a working-class identity is to have the experiences of being a working-class student. These experiences are not separate from what it means to be working-class in a general sense.

McLaren (1986) looked at how Catholic identity was produced in a Catholic school through the lens of ritual performance. Working-class students resisted the classroom culture because it denied the libidinal dispositions of their "street-corner culture." The students shifted identities as they passed from the space of the street corner to that of the classroom. When mapped out, the structure of the school's classroom rituals indicate a continual procession of performances which transfer students back and forth between their streetcorner and student states of being. The students resisted the transitions to the student state as a means of trying to penetrate the dominant ideology (i.e.-territoriality) of the school. Complicating a pure class analysis such as that of Willis, McLaren's study looked at class as it intersected with Catholicism; the social construction of working-class and Catholic identities for the students were intertwined. The meaning of the school space was in part created by symbols of Catholicism, such as crucifixes and pictures of the pope, which surveilled the thoughts and behaviors of students. The symbols represented a "heavenly community" that the Catholic mind imagined to exist beyond the immediate presence of the symbolic objects and human subjects themselves. In other words, the symbols represented an absence of the other members of the imagined community within the physical context of the school. Although the school was supportive of the struggle for social justice in both words and actions, the tight control that teachers had over the meanings of religious symbols and texts served as a point of resistance for students. Also, some teachers constructed students as culturally deprived or even cognitively inadequate as a means of accounting for the cultural dissonance in their classrooms and school.

In another groundbreaking critical ethnography entitled *Ain't No Makin' It*, Jay MacLeod (1987) examines the combinatory influence of poverty

and race on the aspirations of teenagers living in an inner-city housing project. Rather than studying two groups from different social classes at the same school, MacLeod studied two groups who had the same social class background but different racial identities. MacLeod's two groups, the "Hallway Hangers" and the "Brothers," lived in the same urban housing project. The Hallway Hangers were an all White and male group who rejected the achievement ideology of the school. They were non-compliant in school and often turned to alcohol and drugs to pass the time. Situated within the material evidence of generations of poverty, they saw conforming to the dominant order as having only limited possibilities. They have seen their parents struggle against the same obstacles and not succeed. Their parents, who themselves are critical of the achievement ideology, do not contradict their sons' opposition to academic work. Like Willis's lads, the agency of the Hallway Hangers is constrained by an economic structure which patterns working-class experience and the reproduction of working-class identity. However, one major difference in MacLeod's study is that the Hallway Hangers blame their situation on themselves and Black people rather than the middle class.

The other group in the study, The Brothers, were all Black and male, except for one White member. The Brothers were much more conforming to the culture of schooling than the Hallway Hangers. They saw schooling as an opportunity to achieve economic success as long as they worked hard and followed the rules. Their compliance was evident in their behavior in the classroom and around the housing project. MacLeod explains their conformity as a narrative of hope built out of the civil rights movement. According to MacLeod, The Brothers were able to attribute the current poverty of their families to the legacy of racism. They seemed to ready to

embrace the possibility that the American Dream was possible for them in the post-civil rights era of integrationism. MacLeod argues that the Brothers' perspectives represent "the achievement ideology's capacity to mystify structural constraints and encourage high aspirations" (p. 126). At home, the parents of the Brothers, who are either unemployed or underemployed, instill in them the belief that the U.S. is a place of open opportunity. Meanwhile, at school the Brothers are getting poor grades in low-track classes and pointing the finger at themselves for their failure. Another part of the problem is that they have a limited understanding of the job market. Although they did have work experience, the jobs they obtained were with federally funded summer youth programs and not private industry. MacLeod contends that the school should have done more to prepare them for the structural realities of the economic system in which they live.

Taking a deeper ethnographical look at the relationship between conformity and resistance amongst Black students, Signithia Fordham (1996) argues that Black people's belief in the achievement ideology has faded since the civil rights movement as new generations see the growing gaps of class status within the Black community. She contends that Blacks who have been successful in the era of integration have tended to take on a "raceless" persona whereby they reject the culture of Blackness for conformity to the Whiteness as a means of individual social mobility. However, many of these same Black people eventually find out that their success within a White-dominated context is based in part on their racelessness because Whites who control access to jobs are less threatened by Blacks who do not "act Black." For Black students, their desire to succeed in school are caught up in the contradictory demands of the school and the Black community. Many Blacks in the inner-city have come to know schools as White institutions and often

code academic success as "acting White." Conversely, "acting Black" in school means to develop identity strategies, such as "passing" (i.e.-actively seeking a passing grade rather than a high grade) and being a jokester, that lets other Black students know that they are full members of the Black community (Fordham, 1988; Ogbu, 1992). Opposition to Whiteness is thus translated into a system of internal community surveillance which pressures many Black children to disengage from schools as they are currently territorialized.

Fordham's ethnography connects the idea of "imagined communities" to resistance and conformity in interesting and powerful ways. As I see it, maybe the most important move it allowed her to make was to relate the identity constructions of Black students to the imagined presence and absence of both the Black and White communities. The constructions of Blacks and Whites in the minds of Blacks students meant that those not physically present at the school were still implicated in the problem of the academic success of Black students. For example, Black students' investment in the imagined Black community is related to the emergence of group loyalty as a cultural experience of Blackness that is situated within territory-community conflicts with Whiteness. The governmentality of Blackness surveils against Whiteness by patrolling its membership and assembling a counter-territoriality.

> One can be denied group membership because critical group-specific behaviors, attitudes, and activities are perceived to be at variance with those thought to be appropriate to the group. These significant characteristics are culturally patterned and serve to distinguish "us" from "them." (Fordham, 1996, p. 72)

Black governmentality is a subjectivity that is produced relative to encounters with both Whiteness and Blackness. It is a territorial strategy of political and moral organizing that is critical of "conformity as resistance" and thus

surveils the "raceless" persona's of some Black community members. The recognition and counter-action of the territoriality of Whiteness and its various manifestations is a primary feature of Black governmentality. Since colorblindness is a dominant strategy of Whiteness, Blacks who also adopt colorblindness as a strategy will be surveilled by Black governmentality and may feel alienated from both Black and White communities. Meanwhile, the cultural and institutional racism of Whiteness exalts Blacks who are seen as less threatening to the privilege of Whiteness and denigrates other Blacks who resist assimilation to Whiteness.

One last critical ethnography that warrants close inspection is Perry Gilmore's (1985) research on literacy achievement in an elementary school in a low-income Black urban residential area. Members of the school community were more likely to attribute literacy problems to social rather than cognitive aspects. Faculty, administrators, parents, and even students saw the social characteristic of "attitude" as being more related to academic success than intelligence. Students who were perceived as having "good attitudes" were more likely to gain admittance into high-track classes and be considered successful students. Students with "bad attitudes" were usually placed in low-track classes and given remedial work. Gilmore identified two types of controversial behavioral events that marked students both as having a bad attitude and as being Black. Some Black students displayed a type of behavior called *stylized sulking* during conflicts with teachers. Stylized sulking is a non-verbal combination of facial expressions and body gestures that demonstrates the student's non-submissiveness to the authority of the teacher. The performance of stylized sulking has a regular and recognized structure that clearly communicated to the teacher and other students the student's emotions. Students who exhibited stylized sulking were more

likely to be identified as having a bad attitude. Both Black and White teachers considered stylized sulking as part of a stereotypically Black communicative style. Students who shied away from stylized sulking and opted instead to strike a submissive pose in conflicts with teachers were less likely to be disciplined and more likely to be seen as having a good attitude.

The other controversial behavior, *Doin' steps*, is a dance display that consists of chanting rhymes, foot stomping, and hand clapping. They were performed by Black girls outside of the classroom where they often drew audiences. School officials eventually banned the steps because they saw them as being representative of hypersexuality and bad attitudes. In contrast to their teachers' negative image of their literacy and citizenship skills, Black girls doing the steps demonstrated to audiences their competency at literal spelling, leadership, and linguistic ingenuity. Like stylized sulking, teachers saw the steps as a Black cultural practice suggestive of a bad attitude.

Gilmore's study reveals that school officials and parents promote a system of monitoring the boundaries of academic knowledge that is intertwined with perceptions of Black cultural styles and practices. The dominant culture of the school dictates when, where, and how the display of academic skills should be demonstrated. Black students resist school control by establishing places for their own discursive forms and bodily displays where they can communicate their social value and worth to those who are willing to pay attention. Gilmore concludes by saying that sulking and the steps were images associated with Black slaves in the U.S. Many of the Black students portrayed their resistance to the domination of the school through these same images, which were considered to be bad behavior by those with authority. Gilmore was concerned about this historical correlation to racism since "social alignment with the school is usually interpreted as literacy

achievement while social resistance is often understood as literacy skill deficiency" (p. 126).

Academic achievement, which is the common measure of student success, is not so much about cognitive abilities or skills acquisition as it is about how the territorial practices of teachers and others at a school create alienation, resistance, and community membership. The reproduction of social class, through the various modalities of race and gender, is culturally organized and experienced through the institutional rituals of regulating identity. Those who do not control the means to plan and construct the legitimized discourses, materialities, and behaviors of school life turn to counter-school cultures, or counter-territorialities, to find a place to recover their humanity. Unfortunately, schools do not provide the kind of democratic education that is inclusive of historically disenfranchised students, mainly because of the territoriality of Whiteness. The normative socio-spatial practices and representations of space around which schools are organized both produce and exclude many poor students and students of color. The classrooms are places where the voices of alienated students are silenced and denigrated (Fine, 1991). And when these students reach the legal age, they are "pushed out" of school in startling numbers.

References

Anderson, B. (1991). Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism (2nd ed.). London and New York: Verso.

Anyon, J. (1980). Social class and the hidden curriculum of work. Journal of Education, 162 (1), 67-92.

Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). Schooling in capitalist America. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Carter, R. (1997). Is White a race? Expressions of White racial identity. In M. Fine, L. Weis, L. Powell, & L. Mun Wong (Eds.), Off White: Readings on race, power, and society. New York and London: Routledge.

Cross, W. E. (1991). Shades of Black: Diversity in African-American identity. Philadelphia: Temple University.

Darder, A. (1993). How does the culture of the teacher shape the classroom experience of Latino students?: The unexamined question in critical pedagogy. In S. Rothstein (Ed.), Handbook of schooling in urban America (pp. 195-221). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Delpit, L. (1995). Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom. New York: The New Press

Fine, M. (1991). Framing dropouts: Notes on the politics of an urban public high school. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Fordham, S. (1988). Racelessness as a factor in Black students' school success: Pragmatic strategy or pyrrhic victory? Harvard Educational Review, 58 (1), 54-84.

Fordham, S. (1996). Blacked out: Dilemmas of race, identity, and success at Capital High. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, M. (1977). Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison. Alan Sheridan (Trans.). New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1986). Of other spaces. Diacritics, 16, 22-27.

Frankenberg, R. (1994). Whiteness and Americanness: Examining constructions of race, culture, and nation in White women's life narratives. In S. Gregory & R. Sanjeck (Eds.), Race. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Gallagher, C. (1997). White racial formation: Into the Twenty-First Century. In R. Delgado & J. Stefanic (Eds.), Critical White studies: Looking behind the mirror (pp. 291-299). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Gilmore, P. (1985). "Gimme room": School resistance, attitude, and access to literacy. Journal of Education, 167 (1), 111-128.

Giroux, H. (1983). Theory and resistance in education: A pedagogy for the opposition. London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Giroux, H. (1997). White squall: Resistance and the pedagogy of whiteness. Cultural Studies, 11 (3), 376-389.

Goffman, E. (1961). Asylums: Essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates. Chicago: Aldine.

Haymes, S. N. (1995). Race, culture, and the city: A pedagogy for Black urban struggle. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Helms, J. (1990). Black and White racial identity: Theory, research, and practice. Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Herbert, S. (1997). Policing space: Territoriality and the Los Angeles Police Department. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

hooks, b. (1990). Yearning: Race, gender, and cultural politics. Boston: South End Press.

hooks, b. (1992). Representing Whiteness in the Black imagination. In L. Grossberg, C. Nelson, & P. Treichler (Ed.), Cultural studies (pp. 338-346). New York and London: Routledge.

Keith, M., & Pile, S. (1993). Introduction part 1: The politics of place. In M. Keith & S. Pile, Place and the politics of identity (pp. 1-21). New York and London: Routledge.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). Metaphors we live by. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Lefebvre, H. (1991). The production of space. (D. Nicholson-Smith, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers Inc. (Original work published 1974)

MacLeod, J. (1987). Ain't no makin' it: Leveled aspirations in a low-income neighborhood. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, Inc.

Marcus, G. (1986). Ethnography in the modern world system. In J. Clifford & G. Marcus (Eds.), Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography (pp. 165-193). Berkeley: University of California Press.

McIntosh, P. (1997). White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in women's studies. In R. Delgado & J. Stefanic (Eds.), Critical White studies: Looking behind the mirror (pp. 291-299). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

McIntyre, A. (1997a). Constructing an image of a White teacher. Teachers College Record, 98 (4), 653-681.

McIntyre, A. (1997b). Making meaning of whiteness: Exploring racial identity with White teachers. Albany: State University of New York Press.

McLaren, P. (1986). Schooling as a ritual performance: Towards a political economy of educational symbols and gestures. London: Routledge.

McLaren, P. (1994). Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education (2nd ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman Publishing Group.

McLaren, P. (1997). Revolutionary multiculturalism: Pedagogies of dissent for the new millennium. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

McLaren, P., Leonardo, Z., & Allen, R. L. (in press). Epistemologies of Whiteness: Transforming and transgressing pedagogic knowledge. In R. Mahalingham & C. McCarthy (Eds.), Multicultural Curriculum. New York and London: Routledge.

Ogbu, J. (1992). Understanding cultural diversity and learning. Educational Researcher, November, 5-14.

Pile, S. (1996). The body and the city: Psychoanalysis, space and subjectivity. New York and London: Routledge.

Sack, R. D. (1986). Human territoriality: Its theory and history. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sitton, T. (1980). Inside school spaces: Rethinking the hidden dimension. Urban Education, 15 (3), 65-82.

Sleeter, C. (1996). White silence, White solidarity. In N. Ignatiev & J. Garvey (Eds.), Race traitor (pp. 257-265). New York and London: Routledge.

Spring, J. (1996). American education (7th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Soja, E. (1971). The political organization of space. (Resource Paper No. 8). Washington, DC: American Association of Geographers Commission on College Geography.

Soja, E. (1996). Thirdspace. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers, Inc.

Tatum, B. D. (1997). "Why are all the Black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?" New York, BasicBooks.

Wellman, D. (1977). Portraits of White racism. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Willis, P. (1977). Learning to labour. Lexington: D. C. Heath.

Wortham, S. (1992). Participant examples and classroom interaction. Linguistics and Education, 4, 195-217.